[President.]

move the motion, then the further procedure begins to operate. Supposing it is against public interests to advert the motion in the House, then it will never come before the House. When it comes before the House and the President reads it, it means that he has given consent to it. That alone is not enough. It is open to the President to stand on technicalities and say that the honourable member should ask for leave to make the motion. That is the correct technical rule. But that rule has not been strictly adhered to here. By convention it is taken for granted that he makes the motion for leave and thereupon the President gives his ruling. If the rule is to be strictly adhered to, then, after question time the honourable member should get up in his seat and say that he wishes to make an adjournment motion and then the President will say that he has received notice of an adjournment motion before giving consent for the motion being made. If the honourable members, by general consent, want the full process to be gone through, there is no objection to follow the rules in their logical conclusions.

MR. C. JEBAMONY NADAR: Supposing the President does not read the adjournment motion. In that case can it be said that the member in charge of the motion was not vigilent in standing up and asking for leave to make the motion?

PRESIDENT: I do not know what the learned member is referring to. He is probably referring to some observations of mine or that of the honourable Deputy President. The honourable member who has sat down just now is right in saying that yesterday a mistake was committed by the Chair in so far as the Chair did not announce that notice of a motion for adjournment has been received before the occupant of the Chair withdrew. To that extent, the honourable member is prefectly right.

The House will now resume discussion of the Audit Report and Appropriation Accounts.

DISCUSSION OF THE REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE—(*contd.*)

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI (*Tiruvalla*): Sir, the reply given by the Financial Secretary regarding the violation of the rule laid in Article 930 of the Financial and Account Code, Part I, by all Heads of Departments except the Financial Secretary was neither convincing nor satisfactory. In regard to the invariable violations of this Rule, the Financial Secretary used to assure the House on similar previous occasions also that he would see that the mistake was not committed in future. But a comparison of the Audit Report and Appropriation Accounts, for the year 1113 with that of the year 1112 will show that the result was becoming worse and worse. When at least three of the Heads of Departments complied with this rule in 1112, it will be seen from the Audit Report of the year 1113 that no other departmental

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

head excepting the Financial Secretary cared to comply with th most important rule. If this rule cannot be made to be strictly complied with by the Heads of Departments I do not see any reason why we should have such a rule as a dead letter. The results of the violation of this salutory rule are far reaching in its effect as the su p'us funds remaining in the hands of the Heads of Departments, which uld have been utilised for urgent public needs will naturally become locked up unnecessarily.

It is equally disappointing and regrettable to find that the members first elected by both the Houses of the Legislature to the Public Accounts Committee to examine the accounts of the year 1113 were not enabled to function as such on account of the accounts not having been made ready for the scrutiny of these members. This, of course, is tantamount to a disrespect shown to the Legislature which had the privilege of electing those members to the Public Accounts Committee. Any how, I trust that better results will be shown in future years and hence I do not wish to press this motion.

PRESIDENT : Has the Financial Secretary anything to say?

MR. M. GOVINDA PILLAI (*Financial Secretary to Government*) : I have given detailed explanation to the several points that he has urged yesterday.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : Sir, in view of the explanation given by the Financial Secretary I do not press the motion. I move the second resolution that stands in my name. It reads thus:—

> "This Assembly recommends to Government that stringent and exemplary steps be taken against public servants who commit frauds and misappropriation of Government money".

The object of this resolution is to impress upon the Government the indispensable necessity of taking stringent and exemplary steps agianst public servants who commit frauds and misappropriatio n of Government money. A perusal of the Audit Report and Appropriation Accounts of the years 1112 and 1113 will certainly convince the House that the frauds and misappropriation of Government money have always been on the increase from year to year. While 15 cases of such misappropriations and financial irregularities were brought to light in the report of the year 1112, the Audit report shows that there were 18 cases of such misappropriation in the Land Revenue Department in the year 1113. I am definitely of the opinion that the main reason for the increase in the financial irregularities and misappropriation, is the inadequacy of the punishment and the inordinate delay in passing final orders awarding punishments to the delinquents concerned. Chapter V of the Audit Report shows that in 44 cases of financial irregularities and misappropriations reported in 1112 final orders have not yet been passed by the Government. This shows that there is inordinate delay in passing final orders awarding punishment to the delinquents. The belated punishments to the delinquents will certainly detract much from the diterrent effect of such punishments

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. Puliyoor T. P. Velayudhan Pillai.]

In many cases of misappropriations reported in the Audit report, the punishments awarded to the delinquents do not appear to be sufficient and adequate. They are only nominal. Paragraphs 40, 52, 53 and 55 of the Audit Report will bear testimony to my statement. Paragraph 40 of the Report shows as follows, a case of misappropriation to the extent of Rs. 601-7-1:—

"A case of misappropriation of Government money to the extent of Rs. 601-7-1 by a clerk of an industrial institution was brought to light by the Out Audit staff of the Account Office when they audited the accounts of the institution in 1113. The amount represented the stipends and caution money drawn in excess and shown as disbursed to the apprentices who underwent training in the institution Under the rules, stipends are not payable to apprentices for periods of their absence. But it was observed in the course of audit, that stipends were drawn in certain cases for periods of absence also and shown as disbursed to the apprentices. On further scrutiny, it appeared that two sets of attendance registers were maintained in the office, one by the instructors engaging classes and the other by the office. Stipends were drawn on the basis of the latter register which included also names not to be found in the class attendance register. After drawing the money the delinquent clerk adopted a device to get the acquittance of the students for all the amounts so drawn. In each case the acknowledgment of the apprentice was first obtained for the actual amount due and paid to him, and then the balance amount of stipend irregularly drawn for the period of absence, was entered just below the line and bracketted with the first, so as to imply that the acquittance had been for both the amounts. The total amount thus misappropriated by the clerk was found to be Rs. 601-7-1. He was immediately placed under suspension pending enquiry, and the amount was realised from him and remitted into the Treasury."

This is one case in which, I submit, that the punishment was inadequate. Then with regard to paragraph 53. In paragraph 53, it is stated thus:

"A sum of Rs. 146-16-0 drawn from the Pre-Audit Treasury by an Assistant Devaswom Commissioner on account of the pay of the Rameswaram Vicharanadar for the period from Mithunam 1111 to Edavom 1112 was seen to have been not disbursed to the employee. On enquiry, it was found that a clerk in the Assistant Devaswom Commissioner's Office was responsible for the non-disbursement of the amount. The Bills for the claims were prepared by this clerk himself, but they do not appear to have been passed through the Manager of the office. The clerk was placed under suspension for a period of 1 year 3 months and 9 days in all."

I again submit that this also is a sure index of the inadequate nature of the punishment awarded to delinquents who misappropriate Government money. A third instance is also mentioned in the report. This is what it says:

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

"During the final closing of the accounts of the works done in connection with the Town distribution system of the Willingdon Water Works Project, it was found that materials to the value of Rs. 806 15-0 were shown as issued in excess for the works. The explanation of the then Section Officer in charge of the work was called for and he explained that the issue of materials recorded in the measurement books was based on a data worked out by him and was not as per actual quantity of materials used. Since the above explanation was not convincing, the whole matter was placed before Government and their orders solicited to adjust the over-issues by credit to the sub-heads concerned. The final orders of Government in the matter are awaited."

It is not seen whether the officer responsible was punished in any way and so I move my resolution that stringent and exemplary steps be taken against public servants who commit frauds and misappropriation of Government money, and I commend this resolution to the unanimous acceptance of this House.

MR. M. GOVINDA PILLAI: Sir, I oppose the motion. In opposing it I may state for the information of the honourable mover and the other honourable members of this House that in all cases Government have bestowed their anxious consideration, and in several cases of fraud and misappropriation which were brought to their notice, they have awarded punishments which they considered equitable and fair. There might have been delays in deciding cases but the House may rest assured that in all such cases investigations are still incomplete. Government cannot pass final orders till they are satisfied that the investigation is complete. Hence in some cases delay is certainly inevitable. So far as the particular case in the P. W. Department, I may say that the officer concerned was compulsorily retired and in regard to the other officers who were also responsible for the perpetration of the same fraud, their cases are still being investigated and Government have not come to a final decision. Mr. T. P. Velayudhan Pillai seems to be of the view that as soon as the report of a case is brought to the notice of the Government, orders should immediately follow. Sir, this is not possible unless the deinquents concerned are caught red handed.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: May I know with regard to the 44 cases reported in 1112 whether it was impossible for the Government to get the explanation and pass their final orders till this time?

MR. M GOVINDA PILLAI: Well, Sir, probably Government have not been satisfied with the explanations tendered or with the nature of the investigations conducted. Several points have arisen during the course of the investigation and as the decision of the Government is final they should have the satisfaction that they have passed their orders after a thorough, decent and satisfactory enquiry. In such cases delay is certainly inevitable.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: May I know the reasons for the increasing nature of cases of misappropriations in the Land Revenue Department?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. M. GOVINDA PILLAI: Sir, sometimes the ingenuity of Government is effectively circumvented by the perversity of their own subordinates. Government are trying their best to put a stop to this form of corruption in public service, but still as long as human nature remains what it is, at times their efforts are frustrated.

MR. P. SIVARAMA PILLAI (*Menachil* cum *Tolupuzha*): May I know why such cases occur in increasing numbers in the Land Revenue Department only?

MR. M. GOVINDA PILLAI: The difference in the number of cases is only 14 to 18 and I do not think that that difference is so striking as to censure the whole Department.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI (*Tovala* cum *Agastisvaram*): May I know whether the number of offenders is directly due to the kind of recruitment adopted by the Department?

MR. M. GOVINDA PILLAI I don't believe that it is due to the kind of recruitment made. But, Sir, it is due to human nature. Even if the Service Commissioner selects the best member there will be still persons who are guilty of aberrations from the right path.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: May I know whether Government have devised any means to check cases of misappropriations in the Land Revenue Department after the Audit Report of 1112 was discussed?

MR. M. GOVINDA PILLAI: Government have issued stringent instructions to the Land Revenue Department as well as to the Audit Department to see that checking and inspection work should be promptly and rigorously carried on.

MR. K. P. KOCHUKORA THARAKAN (*Kunnatnad* cum *Parur*): പണാപഹരണവുംമറ്റും നടത്തുന്ന ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാരുടെപേരിൽ കർശനമായ നടപടികളും നടത്തി ശരിയായവിധം ശിക്ഷിക്കുകയാണെങ്കിൽ അഴിമതികളും കുറയാൻ സൗകര്യമില്ലേ?

MR. M. GOVINDA PILLAI: Sir, Government feel that enquiries have been very rigorously conducted and the punishments meted out to the delinquents are fair and equitable. I may also inform the House that the Dewan has recently instructed heads of departments to bring to his personal notice cases of misappropriations and frauds so that Government may take adequate and prompt measures.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: May I know whether, since the instructions issued by the Dewan, any head of the department has informed the Government of any such cases?

MR. M. GOVINDA PILLAI: The instructions were issued only a fortnight ago.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: Sir, in view of the definite assurance made by the Financial Secretary, I do not press the motion.

MR. K. NARAYANAPERUMAL NADAR (*Tovala* cum *Agastisvaram*): Sir, I move that "this Assembly recommends to Government that the Standing Rule that 'no work should be started by the P. W. Department, without first obtaining sanction to estimate and funds except in the cases of extreme emergency' be enforced with greater care."

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Sir, the rule embodying this resolution is a standing one. It was passed on the 2nd May 1935. In the Audit Report of 1111 and 1112 it is seen that the department was asked to pay due attention to this rule. But the department has not paid any heed to it. The total expenditure during 1113 was 34·1 lakhs and the total amount under objection was 6·37 lakhs. The percentage of amounts spent under objection comes to 18·5 per cent or nearly 20 per cent. But the percentage of amount under objection in 1112 to total grant is only 12 %. It is clear from this that the department is going from bad to worse. If this sort of irregular expenditure is not checked in time I am afraid there will come a time when the department will spend the allotment or nearly the whole amount without sanction to estimates. The outstanding analysis of the objection is given in appendix C, page 348. If nearly 20 per cent can be objected in this manner I have no hesitation in saying that the Travancore P. W. D. is a public waste department. With these few words I move this resolution for the acceptance of this House.

MR. M. GOVINDA PILLAI: Sir, I oppose the resolution. If I have your permission the Chief Engineer may be asked to reply.

MR. M. S. DORASWAMI AIYANGAR (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): Sir, Mr. K. Narayana Perumal Nadar has brought forward a resolution before the House which reads thus:

> "This Assembly recommends to Government that the standing rule that 'no work should be started by the P. W. Department, without first obtaining sanction to estimate and funds except in the cases of extreme emergency' be enforced with greater care".

Page 210—Chapter III—Irregularities on works—outlay—Para 73 of the Audit Report and Appropriate Accounts for 1113 M. E. may be perused. It is stated therein that the practice of incurring expenditure on works without estimates or in excess of sanctioned estimates still continues in the P. W. D. even though the Government and the Accounts Department have specifically invited the attention of the department to the rule prohibiting such expenditure. It is also stated that out of a total expenditure of 34·10 lakhs incurred by P. W. D. (both Capital and Revenue) during 1113 M. E. an amount of 2·88 lakhs had to be objected for want of estimates, and another amount of 3·30 lakhs on account of excess over estimates.

Except in cases of extreme urgency, works are not started by the department and expenditure incurred without sanctioned estimates and funds. In urgent cases the expenditure incurred are being regularised by sanctioning estimates subsequently or submitting memos of cost for sanction. Unless this is done expenditure is kept under objection. As per para 13 of the G. O. on Devolution of Powers "The Chief Engineer is competent to sanction in case of emergency the commencement of any original works or of any special or periodical repairs and incur expenditure up to any reasonable and necessary amount, reporting the fact forthwith to Government where the estimated cost exceeds the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. M. S. Doraswami Aiyangar.]

limit of his power to accord administrative approval and taking all steps necessary to regularise the expenditure". The details that make up the total of 2·58 lakhs held under objection for want of estimates are not available in the office.

The expenditure on the following works incurred in 1113 M. E. may be included in them.

(1) A sum of Rs. 15,926 spent on Travancore House, Madras, for works carried out during the year.

(2) Rs. 6,870 paid to Signior Omedeo, an Italian Engineer, for Investigation of Hydraulic Problems for which no sanctioned estimate was in existence.

(3) A number of works in connection with the Civil works for the Pallivasal Hydro Electric Scheme was paid for without sanctioned estimates during the year as the consolidated revised estimate for these works could not be made out during the year for want of information from the Resident Engineer then.

A satisfactory explanation can be given only after ascertaining the details from the Accountant General as this portion of the report was not furnished to the Chief Engineer for remarks before it was published.

Again, as regards excess over sanctioned estimates for which a sum of Rs. 3·30 lakhs was held under objection during 1113 M. E., it may be pointed out that the Division Officers and the Chief Engineer are competent to sanction excess expenditure over sanctioned estimates up to 5 per cent and 10 per cent respectively if such excesses were found actually necessary and unavoidable, and such excesses are sanctioned only at the time of submission of completion reports. When such excesses are sanctioned the amount of outstanding objection pointed out above under this head will automatically vanish.

In conclusion it may be said that expenditure without sanctioned estimates are incurred only in very extreme and emergent cases taking all steps to regularise such expenditure at the earliest possible date. I may in this connection invite the attention of the honourable member to Appendix A from which it will be seen that the department has shown special vigilance in clearing up such objectionable items.

The opening balance in 1113 M. E.	11·00 lakhs.
Objection accrued in 1113	6·82 lakhs.
Objection cleared up in 1113	10·94 lakhs.

This shows that the P. W. D. is earnest to minimise accumulation of arrears. In this respect the Chief Engineer is invested with certain discretionary powers which are also exercised with due care and previous consultation. In many cases such expenditure is incurred only after reporting the facts to Government pointing out the urgency and getting their informal approval, though regular sanctions are delayed till after the estimates are framed and sent up. With the assurance that the discretionary powers will be exercised only with extreme care and caution in future also, as is being done hitherto, I would suggest to the honourable member to kindly withdraw the resolution.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. K. NARAYANAPERUMAL NADAR: Sir, this report has been carefully prepared by the learned Financial Secretary. And he says in page 210 "The attention of the Department had several times been drawn to this rule both by Government and the Accounts Department and that the practice of incurring expenditure on works, without estimates or in excess of the sanctioned estimates, still continues." In view of this statement made by the Financial Secretary in the report how can I withdraw this resolution? So I press the Resolution.

MR. M. GOVINDA PILLAI: I may inform the honourable member that since issuing the report I have had detailed discussion on this subject with the Accountant General and the Chief Engineer, and I find that several items of expenditure have been held under objection on account of the circumstance that the Chief Engineer and the Executive Engineer, when they in the exercise of the discretion vested in them, sanctioned estimates or obtained the subsequent approval of Government to the estimates concerned, did not communicate such sanctions to the Accountant General in time. If they had communicated the sanctions of such items of expenditure in time to the Accountant General, these items would not have been placed under objection in the manner done, and the observations made in the report could have been obviated thereby. I have the assurance from the Chief Engineer that hereafter he would see that expenditure incurred under "emergent" items would be communicated to the Audit Department without delay.

MR. K. NARAYANAPERUMAL NADAR: Sir, I withdraw the motion.

DISCUSSION OF THE REPORT ON THE WORKING OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE RECRUITMENT RULES.

DR. G. D. NOKES (*Public Service Commissioner*): Sir, I move that the Report on the working of the Public Service Recruitment Rules be taken into consideration.

I do not think it necessary to address to the House more than a few words by way of preliminary observations. The Government order on Public Service Recruitment dated June 1935 provided that the scheme outlined therein was to be worked for three years; and in the final paragraph it was provided that the scheme should be renewed at the end of three years in the light of the existing circumstances. The order did not provide that the review should be conducted by the legislature; but Government thought the question one of such public importance that the report of the Public Service Commissioner has been printed and circulated, and is in the possession of the members of this House. Further, in view of certain interpellations during the last session of the legislature relating to the number of candidates who have been recruited and are in service, Government have ordered that the relevent statistics should be collected and consolidated and supplied to the members of this House. They are contained in the printed pamphlet with the green cover. Again, the Administration Report of the Public Service Department for last year, i. e., 1114, was prepared with special expedition, Government orders on it have been passed and it has been printed and circulated early. Thus, the position now is that the members have in their possession every essential fact and every essential figure for the purpose of the consideration of this subject.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN: (*Quilon cum Kottarakara*) Sir, I wish to make a few observations on the Report of the Public Service Recruitment Rules. It was a result of a long-felt need that the inequalities and the difficulties experienced by certain sections of the people of the State in regard to appointments in Public Service, that the Government, as we all know, instituted a special officer to go into the details of the whole question and report on the matter. Accordingly, G. O. R. Dis. No. 893/Genl, dated 25th June 1935, was issued and thereafter the Public Service Commissioner with a special staff had been brought into existence. Special rules had been promulgated for the working of the new scheme. Now, after some three years of operation of the rules, we are called upon to pronounce on the actual results that have been achieved by the new scheme and as to how far the results have justified themselves in the object for which this institution was inaugurated.

In this connection, I would point out certain facts for the consideration of this House. Government with the best of intentions and the Public Service Commissioner, one of the best available men and with the best of intentions, have not been in a position to bring about the desired effect through the operation of this scheme. Though we have a set of rules and though the Commissioner tried to do his best, the result has been far from satisfactory. In the first place, from the Report itself, we find that several departments have been excluded from the purview of the Public Service Commissioner and the operation of the Public Service Rules. I shall refer to the University, the Police, ...

PRESIDENT: The University has nothing to do with the Government. It is a separate institution.

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN: My submission is that the University is of the Government and.....

PRESIDENT: The Honourable member must be aware, as having participated in the University Legislation, that it is a statutory body created by the labours of this House and the other Honourable House and embodied in a statute.

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN: I bow to the decision of the Chair.

PRESIDENT: It is not a decision; it is the fact.

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN: Still, my point is that I want to draw the attention of the University authorities and the Government to the necessity of giving adequate representation to the unrepresented communities in that institution as well. That is my point. Leaving apart the University, the State Transport Department, the Devaswom Department, the Police Department, the Anchal Department in certain respects, the Medical Department, the Military Department and the Credit Bank.....

PRESIDENT: What has the Credit Bank to do with the Government. Government gives a grant to the S. P. C. A. or any other institution just as it gives a support to the University or to the Credit Bank. Does it mean that Government can look into these matters?

Is the honourable member quite correct in including the Medical Department as having been excluded from the purview of these rules?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

DR. G. D. NOKES : It relates to certain minor appointments in the Medical Department which are not within the scope of the Public Service Commissioner. Other major exclusions include the University of Travancore, the Travancore Credit Bank and the Road Transport Department, which institutions have been founded since the rules were passed.

PRESIDENT . The University could not but be excluded from the purview of the Public Service Commissioner since the latter has nothing to do w th the University.

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN : But this is put along with the State Transport Department.

PRESIDENT : The State Transport is a Government department run on commercial lines. Certain lines of policy have been adopted with regard to that department. It is open for the honourable member to criticise the Government's decision, as regards the State Transport Department, that it should not be treated as other departments.

MR. C. V. CHANDRASEKHARAN : Even with regard to the University, though the Government have excluded the appointments from the purview of the Public Service Commissioner, Government have ordered that the appointments should be made more or less on the same lines.

PRESIDENT : Is the honourable member prepared to discuss the question on the floor of the House.

MR. C. V. CHANDRASEKHARAN : No, Sir. I wish to point out that the exclusion is not unqualified.

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN : On page 1 of the Report, after dealing with a number of departments excluded from the scope of the Public Service Commissioner, it is stated that "other major exclusions from the operation of the rules have been made in respect of departments or institutions founded since the rules were passed, and include the University of Travancore, the Travancore Credit Bank and the Road Transport Department. There have also been excluded under Rule V, certain appointments in the Medical and Anchal Departments, and in the Police Department during an emergency." The last portion of the last sentence in that paragraph, "On the whole however it may fairly be stated that no department or class of appointments in a department has been excluded from the operation of the Public Service Recruitment Rules except for good reason in the interests of the Public Service itself," is not clear and it requires elucidation and clarification on the part of the Public Service Commissioner. From time to time, as has been admitted by the Public Service Commissioner and especially as found in the Report for 1114, changes and alterations in the rules for recruitment have been made and those changes have to a certain extent, nullified the wholesome object with which the Public Service Commissioner was appointed.

Then, coming to another point, speaking generally, the higher division of the Public Service is left completely out of the control of the Public Service Commissioner, except to the extent that a special

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

competitive examination is conducted where merit alone is taken into consideration without any emphasis or any special indulgence given in respect of less represented communities. I don't go into the details of that at present.

Then there is the intermediate division.

Mr. C. V. CHANDRASEKHARAN: May I point out to the honourable member that the statement is a travesty of the truth, since one-third of the candidates selected for the higher division is, in fact, on basis of less representation and not on the basis of merit.

PRESIDENT: Not *solely* on the basis of merit you mean?

Mr. C. V. CHANDRASEKHARAN: Yes, Sir.

PRESIDENT: The honourable member may proceed.

Mr. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN: I understand that when the honourable member says that one-third has been left for less represented communities, it only shows.....

PRESIDENT: Order, order. I see now what may happen if the debate proceeds on the basis of general observations of this kind. I would, without infringing the liberty of this House, suggest to honourable members to take some time and put forward definite propositions and speak on those propositions. I shall waive any time limit in regard to the giving of notice of resolutions of the kind, but if honourable members proceed on a series of general observations, we shall not be able to crystallise discussion or come to some kind of understanding as to what the opinion of this House is on particular points. For instance, to take one or two outstanding propositions, does this House want a Public Service Commission or Public Service Commissioner? Does this House want an Advisory Body or does it not want? Does it want a Public Service Commissioner who does not belong to what may be called, the contesting communities? Is it the opinion of the House that certain proportions and rotational arrangements should be insisted on in the higher, intermediate and lower divisions? These are some of the points which may be put forward in the form of specific propositions, and discussions may deal with those matters so that we may know where we are. Government are extremely anxious to see that there is not only the fullest possible discussion, but discussion to obtain the points of view of all honourable members so that definite conclusions may be arrived at by this House on the basis of which Government will come to a decision.

Mr. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Changanacherry cum Peermade*): Sir,.....

PRESIDENT: I want to finish what I have to say.

Therefore, if honourable members wish to have some time, I am perfectly willing to adjourn and to meet an hour or two later, and by that time honourable members may put down in writing what are the problems and propositions which they want to discuss under (*a*) On the Intermediate division, (*b*) on the Higher division, and so on. We shall then know exactly what the needs of the House are. But, at this rate, we shall cover a large ground, but at the end of it we will not be much farther from our starting point.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI : Sir, one word to the President-

PRESIDENT : I will call you next. The honourable member may proceed,

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN : Sir, the subject is a very tough one.

PRESIDENT : I know ; so tough that it is necessary further to make it more tender.

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN : My submission on this is that this problem specially requires that all heads are put together and that the Government make use of its best abilities in finding out a solution for the same. The memorial referred to in the latter portion of the report gives several suggestions for the consideration of the Public Service Commissioner. These are concrete suggestions and even these, with the advantages that they necessarily have, have not been approved by the Public Service Commissioner not because the Commissioner has any personal unwillingness in accepting the same but probably in his opinion they are not feasible. The suggestions put forward by a single individual or a party would not do to find out a correct solution. Individuals can only bring in their individual opinions and how improvements can be effected.

PRESIDENT : Let it be clearly understood that it is not the object of the Chair to curtail or to strangle discussion, There are two methods of conducting such discussion, one referring to each paragraph of the report and making general observations on what should be done. In essence what the honourable member suggests would be to adopt a course which he himself rather deprecates, because there will be a series of individual suggestions. The point I was making was that if time were given to honourable members, if heads were put together in the manner suggested by the honourable member, then a kind of *modus vivendi* may be reached. If on the other hand honourable members prefer to go on discussing like this, I have not the slightest objection. I am only making a suggestion for the approval of the house.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI : I was just thinking.....

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN : I have not finished Sir.

PRESIDENT : You can speak after Mr. Padmanabha Pillai has finished.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI : I was just thinking whether I might get the permission of the Chair under the proviso to Rule 58 of the Legislative Rules enabling him to waive the time-limit for resolutions, to move a resolution making recommendations to the Government as to the changes that might be made in the Travancore Public Service Recruitment Rules. If such a resolution is placed before the House, it might enable the honourable members either to throw it out or accept, but it will clarify the issues. Therefore, if the Chair would permit, I would bring forward a resolution for discussion in the House.

PRESIDENT : I was not only willing to permit that but I was willing to permit every honourable member of the House to put forward in the form of a resolution or recommendation to Government such steps

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[President.]

as he thinks would be necessary to bring about the decired result and for that purpose, if honourable members are not ready, I said that I shall adjourn the House now so that it might meet again at 2 o'clock. In the interval honourable members might talk to each other, might come to some kind of conclusion, might put forward specific resolutions before the House and speak on those resolutions. It does not mean that those resolutions will be carried. It is a matter entirely for the House to judge. What is the opinion of the House ?

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI : We agree to the suggestion from the Chair,

PRESIDENT : The House will now adjourn and meet again at 2 o' clock.

[The Assembly adjourned for lunch at 12.25 P. M. and re-assembled at 2 P. M. with the President in the Chair.]

MR. PADIYARA JOSEPH KUNJU (*Chanyanacherry* cum *Peermade*) : സർ, സഭാനടപടികൾ ആരംഭിക്കുന്നതിനുമുമ്പായി അദ്ധ്യക്ഷൻ അവർകളിൽനിന്നും എനിക്കു ഒരു വിവരം അറിയാനുണ്ട്. ഇന്ന് ഇവിടെ വന്നപ്പോൾ എന്റെ മേശമേൽ "കൺക്ലൂഷൻ അഫ് ദി നായർ ഈഴവ കാൺഫറൻസ്" എന്ന പേരുള്ള ഒരുപുസ്തകം കിടക്കുന്നതുകണ്ടു. അതിന്റെ പ്രസിദ്ധീകരണകർത്താവിനേയോ അച്ചടിച്ച പ്രസ്സിനേയോ സംബന്ധിച്ച ഒന്നംതന്നെ അറിയാൻ പാടില്ലെങ്കിലും അതിന്റെ ഒന്നാംപേജിന്റെ "ജി. പി. റി." എന്ന കാണുന്നതുകൊണ്ട് ഗവണ്മെൻറ് പ്രസ്സുഅഫ് ടാവൻകൂർ എന്നാണ് അതിനെ ഞാൻമനസ്സിലാക്കുന്നതു. ഗവണ്മെൻറിന്റെ അറിവോടും അനുമതിയോടുംകൂടിയാണോ ഈ പുസ്തകം ഇവിടെ കൊണ്ടിട്ടുള്ളതെന്നും ഇതിന്റെ ഉദ്ദേശം എന്തെന്നും ഇതിനു എത്രത്തോളം പ്രാധാന്യം ഗവണ്മെൻറു കല്പിക്കുന്നു എന്നും ഈ കൺക്ലൂഷനെ ഗവണ്മെൻറു എങ്ങിനെ സ്വീകരിക്കാൻ പോകുന്നു എന്നും അറിഞ്ഞാൽ കൊള്ളാം.

PRESIDENT : Order, order. Now that this question has been raised, I think the matters should be clarified. Certain members belonging to the Nair community and certain members belonging to the Ezhava community approached the Head of the Administration and suggested that, as there was a possibility of a satisfactory preliminary talk between the members of those communities as introductory to a talk between them and other communities, it would conduce to the general advantage if they were allowed to meet and discuss. The Government have been very anxious that this vexed question of public services with regard to which interpellations and resolutions come to Government continuously and successively, should, if possible, be adjusted on the basis of a mutual concordat. Inasmuch as the Government felt the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

imperative advantage and the need for such a settlement, Government were willing to give all facilities for such discussions. It may be stated at once that Government have, as such, taken no part in those discussions. The Head of the Administration attended one or two of those discussions mainly with a view to express his own personal convictions as to the need for amicable settlement. He did not then, nor do the Government now, propose to pledge themselves to any specific conclusions save in so far as those conclusions derive validity and strength from the concensus of opinion of influential and non-influential communities. The idea was that after these two groups of representatives had discussed the matter amongst themselves, they should meet other communities so that every community in this House and in the country may join in some agreed conclusions. I also made it clear at that time that any further agreements that may be entered into will be welcome and similar facilities will be afforded and that such guidance and assistance as the Head of the Administration and those who are working under his directions may be willing to afford to those communities will be afforded. But it must be clearly understood that there is no partiality towards community A or community B involved in this, nor is it the idea that because this paper has been printed and placed before this House, Government are bound by it. Technically speaking, Government are entitled to ignore these recommendations completely. But it is perfectly true that the Head of the Administration told that conference, and he does not mind telling this House that in a matter of this kind where so easily feelings are roused and such a rankling sense of injustice seems to be present in the minds of members of so many communities, the efforts of the Government and the hopes of the Government would be centered on some agreement to be reached by the various communities by themselves. Government would only be too anxious to act on the basis of that agreement save in so far as they find after careful consideration that they cannot accept any one or more than one of the conclusions, in which case it will be the duty of Government to explain their position on the floor of the House and in public. Therefore, let it be clearly understood that no conclusions ever reached by any conference, formally or informally, whether printed in this press or in that press are binding as such on Government; but Government would pay at the same time very serious attention to any resolutions put forward with a certain amount of agreement amongst communities big or small. At the same time it may be mentioned that because two communities have joined in this matter it does not mean that other communities are so to say put on one side or ignored. The idea was and will continue to be that this will only be a kind of jumping-off ground from which other efforts will be made for the purpose of seeking further and more comprehensive agreement.

As regards printing by the Government Press, I did not know whether the Government Press could take up private work. I am told that they can take up private printing and therefore, the fact that the Government Press printed the proceedings of the conference makes no difference.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly